

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 6 and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,921,352 to Adolfs et al. (“Adolfs”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,116,548 to Mallik et al. (“Mallik”).

Claims 6, 27-29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,889,366 to Fabbiani (“Fabbiani”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,843,598 to Ueda et al. (“Ueda ’598”).

Claims 6 and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fabbiani in view of Ueda ’598, U.S. Patent No. 6,127,066 to Ueda (“Ueda ’066”), and Adolfs.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant cancels claims 6 and 27-31, and presents new claims 32-43.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 32 recites a method for producing the hologram tape of cancelled claim 6 by coupling a hologram recording tape with a master hologram plate and irradiating the master hologram plate with a laser beam to form multiple duplicates of the master hologram, and volume-type sub-holograms are formed on the hologram tape at the same time or sequentially

and in a different area or the same area as the plurality of main-holograms, with each of the sub-holograms indicating information specific to each of the main-holograms. Claims 32-37 recite methods of producing a hologram tape corresponding to canceled claims 27-31. Support for this amendment is provided, for example, on pages 8-11 of the specification.

Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the references cited by the Examiner in rejecting claims 6 and 27-31 discloses a method for producing the hologram tape of cancelled claim 6 as recited in claim 32. The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine two or more of Adolfs, Mallik, Ueda '598, Ueda '066, and Fabbiani. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's argument. The cited references pertain to very different functions and there would have been no motivation to combine them. Adolfs pertains to determining physical characteristics of an object; Mallik pertains to replicating surface relief patterns; Ueda '598 pertains to recording holograms by light exposure; Ueda '066 pertains to multicolor displays; and Fabbiani relates to a security document. With each reference pertaining to a different function – with the only apparent common denominator being the use of holograms in some way – the combinations cited in the Office Action would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to produce the process recited in claim 32. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 32-37 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 38 recites a method for producing the hologram tape of cancelled claim 6 by using a mask of a liquid crystal diode device to create the plurality of unique sub-holograms. Claims 39-43 recite methods of producing a hologram tape corresponding to canceled claims 27-31. Support for this amendment is provided, for example, on pages 10-11 of the specification.

Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the references cited by the Examiner in rejecting canceled claims 6 and 27-31 discloses using a mask of a liquid crystal diode device to create a plurality of unique sub-holograms adjacent to a plurality of main-holograms on a hologram recording tape. While Fabbiani discloses implanted LCDs in optical cards, the disclosure is very different from the method of present invention and does not lend itself to continuous processing of multiple holograms on a hologram recording tape as disclosed by Ueda et al. '598. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 38-43 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Date: March 30, 2005

By: Kent Basson
Kent Basson
Reg. No. 48,125

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel. 202.739.3000
Fax. 202.739.3001